

LOCALLY UNIFORMLY CONVEX NORMS IN BANACH SPACES AND THEIR DUALS

RICHARD HAYDON

Brasenose College, Oxford

ABSTRACT. It is shown that a Banach space with locally uniformly convex dual admits an equivalent norm that is itself locally uniformly convex.

1. INTRODUCTION

If we consider a real Banach space Z under a norm $\|\cdot\|$ and its dual space Z^* , equipped with the dual norm $\|\cdot\|^*$, there are important and well-established connections between convexity properties of $\|\cdot\|^*$ and smoothness properties of $\|\cdot\|$. Indeed, strict convexity of $\|\cdot\|^*$ implies Gâteaux-smoothness of $\|\cdot\|$, locally uniform convexity of $\|\cdot\|^*$ implies Fréchet-smoothness of $\|\cdot\|$ and uniform convexity of $\|\cdot\|^*$ is equivalent to uniform smoothness of $\|\cdot\|$. On the other hand, there would seem to be, a priori, no reason why a convexity condition in the dual space Z^* should imply any sort of convexity in Z . However, it is a consequence of the Enflo-Pisier renorming theorem [3, 14, or IV.4 of 2] that uniform convexity of $\|\cdot\|^*$ implies that there exists a norm $|||\cdot|||$ on Z , *equivalent* to the given norm, which is itself uniformly convex. One can even arrange that this new norm be both uniformly convex and uniformly smooth.

It is natural to ask whether a similar result about equivalent norms holds for the weaker properties of strict convexity and locally uniform convexity. A counterexample to one of these questions was given in [8]: there is a Banach space Z , $\|\cdot\|$ with strictly convex dual, but such that no equivalent norm on Z is strictly convex. That the situation may be better for the third property, locally uniform convexity, was suggested by a theorem of Kenderov and Moors [10]. This states that a Banach space with locally uniformly convex dual has the topological property of being σ -fragmentable. The main result of the present paper is an affirmative answer to the full question about locally uniform convexity.

Theorem A. *Let $Z, \|\cdot\|$ be a Banach space such that the dual norm $\|\cdot\|^*$ on Z^* is locally uniformly convex. There exists an equivalent norm $|||\cdot|||$ on Z which is locally uniformly convex. Moreover, $|||\cdot|||$ may be chosen to have locally uniformly convex dual norm $|||\cdot|||^*$.*

The “moreover” statement in Theorem A is an immediate consequence of the technique of Asplund averaging, for which the reader is referred to §II.4 of [2].

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46B20.

Key words and phrases. locally uniformly convex norm, descriptive compact space.

Now it is known [VIII.3.12 of 2] that a Banach space with a norm which is locally uniformly convex and has locally uniformly convex dual norm admits $\mathcal{C}^1$ -partitions of unity: equivalently, on such a space every continuous real-valued function may be uniformly approximated by functions of class $\mathcal{C}^1$. We thus have the following corollary.

Corollary. *Let Z be a Banach space with locally uniformly convex dual. Every continuous real-valued function on X may be uniformly approximated by functions of class $\mathcal{C}^1$.*

We note that for general Banach spaces Z it is still not known whether the existence on Z of an equivalent Fréchet-smooth norm (or, more generally, a “bump function” of class $\mathcal{C}^1$) implies $\mathcal{C}^1$ approximability as in the above Corollary. In the special case of spaces $Z = \mathcal{C}(K)$, this implication has been established in [6].

Spaces of the type $\mathcal{C}(K)$ play an important part in our proof of Theorem A. It is of course always the case that we may identify Z with a subspace of $\mathcal{C}(K)$, where K is the unit ball of the dual space Z^* , equipped with the weak* topology. When the dual norm $\|\cdot\|^*$ is locally uniformly convex, this K belongs to what Raja [15] has called the class of *Namioka-Phelps* compacts. Theorem A will thus follow from the following $\mathcal{C}(K)$ -renorming theorem.

Theorem B. *Let K be a Namioka-Phelps compact. Then there is a norm on $\mathcal{C}(K)$, equivalent to the supremum norm, which is locally uniformly convex.*

The rest of this paper is devoted to a proof of (a mild generalization of) Theorem B. The definition of a Namioka-Phelps compact, as well as of the various other topological and renorming properties with which we are concerned, will be given in the next section. We then move on to develop some topological machinery before defining a norm in Section 4. The remaining sections contain the proof that this norm is locally uniformly convex. The reader will note the crucial role played by general topology in the proof that follows: though Theorem A clearly has some kind of geometrical content, there is actually surprisingly little geometry in the proof. The key is the topological concept of a *descriptive* space, due to Hansell [7], and a careful analysis of the σ -isolated networks which exist in such spaces. I became aware of the importance of these notions thanks to the works of the Hispano-Bulgarian school of geometric functional analysis, and notably the papers [11, 15, 16]. I am particularly grateful to my friends Anibal Moltó and Pepe Orihuela for many helpful conversations on this material.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let Z be a real vector space and let ϕ be a non-negative real-valued convex function on Z . When $f \in Z$ and $f_r \in Z$ ($r \in \omega$), we shall say that the LUR hypothesis holds for ϕ (and f , and the sequence (f_r)) if

$$\frac{1}{2}\phi(f)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\phi(f_r)^2 - \phi\left(\frac{1}{2}(f + f_r)\right)^2 \rightarrow 0.$$

When the function ϕ is positively homogeneous, this statement is equivalent to saying that both $\phi(f_r)$ and $\phi(\frac{1}{2}(f + f_r))$ tend to $\phi(f)$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. This is recorded as Fact II.2.3 in [2], where it is also noted that, if the function ϕ is an ℓ^2 -sum $\phi^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi_n^2$ of non-negative convex functions and if the LUR hypothesis holds for ϕ , then it holds for each of the ϕ_n . We shall make repeated use of this observation.

We say that a norm $\|\cdot\|$ is locally uniformly rotund *at* a given element f if, whenever the LUR hypothesis holds for $\|\cdot\|$, f and a sequence (f_r) , we necessarily have $\|f - f_r\| \rightarrow 0$. This brings us back to a completely standard definition: we say that a norm on X is *locally uniformly convex* (the term “locally uniformly rotund” and its abbreviation LUR are also used) if it has this property at each $f \in X$.

We now move on to introduce the topological properties that are relevant to our results. Most of these ideas are due to Hansell [7]. Our terminology follows [16], where a succinct account can be found of all the results that we need. A crucial notion is that of a *network* for a topology: a collection $\mathcal{S}$ of subsets of X is said to be a network for the topology $\mathcal{T}$ if every set in $\mathcal{T}$ is a union of sets in $\mathcal{S}$: that is to say, whenever $x \in U \in \mathcal{T}$, there exists $N \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $x \in N \subseteq U$. A family of sets $\mathcal{I}$ is said to be *isolated* for a topology $\mathcal{T}$ if, for each $N \in \mathcal{I}$, there exists $U \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $N \subseteq U$ and $U \cap M = \emptyset$ for all $M \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{N\}$; equivalently, $N \cap \overline{\bigcup \mathcal{I} \setminus \{N\}} = \emptyset$. A family $\mathcal{S}$ is said to be σ -isolated if it can be expressed as $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{I}_n$ with each $\mathcal{I}_n$ isolated.

Let $(X, \mathcal{T})$ be a topological space and let d be a metric on X inducing a topology finer than $\mathcal{T}$. We say that the property $P(d, \mathcal{T})$ holds if there is a sequence $(B_n)_{n \in \omega}$ of subsets of X such that the topology generated by $\mathcal{T} \cup \{B_n : n \in \omega\}$ is finer than the topology $\mathcal{T}_d$ induced by the metric d . An equivalent formulation is that there exists a sequence $(A_n)_{n \in \omega}$ of subsets of X such that the intersections $A_n \cap U$, with $U \in \mathcal{T}$, form a network for $\mathcal{T}_d$. When $P(d, \mathcal{T})$ holds, there is a network $\mathcal{S}$ for the metric topology $\mathcal{T}_d$ which is σ -isolated for the topology $\mathcal{T}$. An equivalent formulation of this statement is that, for each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a covering $\mathcal{S}$ of X , which is σ -isolated for $\mathcal{T}$ and which consists of sets with d -diameter at most ϵ . A compact topological space $(K, \mathcal{T})$ which has property $P(d, \mathcal{T})$ for *some* metric d is said to be *descriptive*. There is an intrinsic characterization of this property: K is descriptive if and only if there is a network for $\mathcal{T}$ which is $\mathcal{T}$ - σ -isolated. Hansell’s general notion of descriptive space [7] is a space X which is Čech-analytic and has a σ -isolated network: we are only concerned with descriptive compact spaces in this paper. Raja [16] shows that the unit ball of a dual Banach space Z^* is descriptive for its weak* topology if and only if Z admits an equivalent norm with “weak* LUR” dual norm.

If $(K, \mathcal{T})$ is compact and has $P(d, \mathcal{T})$ for some $\mathcal{T}$ -lower semicontinuous metric d , then K is called a *Namioka–Phelps compact*. Raja [15] has shown that unit ball of a dual Banach space Z^* is a Namioka–Phelps compact (in the weak* topology) if and only if Z admits an equivalent norm with LUR dual norm. The hard part of this theorem is the “only if” implication. In this paper we just use the easy “if” implication.

As has already been mentioned in the introduction, we shall obtain our main theorem from a renorming result for $\mathcal{C}(K)$ where K is a Namioka–Phelps compact. In fact we prove something slightly more general.

Theorem C. *Let $(K, \mathcal{T})$ be a (descriptive) compact space which has property $P(d, \mathcal{T})$ for a metric d . There is a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on $\mathcal{C}(K)$, equivalent to the supremum norm, which is locally uniformly rotund at f , whenever f is both $\mathcal{T}$ -continuous and d -uniformly continuous.*

Of course, Theorem C shows that there is a LUR norm on $\mathcal{C}(K)$ provided the metric d can be chosen in such a way that *all* $\mathcal{T}$ -continuous functions are d -uniformly continuous. A metric with this property has been called a Reznichenko metric. It

is easy to see that a lower semi-continuous metric is Reznichenko, which is why Theorem C implies Theorem B.

The reader who is concerned solely with the proofs of theorems A and B may omit the remainder of this section, which involves fragmentability, Radon–Nikodym compacta and the delicate distinction between lower semicontinuous metrics and Reznichenko metrics.

The topological space $(X, \mathcal{T})$ is said to be *fragmented* by the metric d if, for every non-empty subset Y of X and every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $U \in \mathcal{T}$ such that the intersection $Y \cap U$ is non-empty and of d -diameter at most ϵ . If there is a sequence $(B_n)_{n \in \omega}$ of subsets of X such that the topology generated by $\mathcal{T} \cup \{B_n : n \in \omega\}$ is fragmented by d then we say that $(X, \mathcal{T})$ is σ -*fragmented* by d . For more about σ -fragmentability the reader is referred to [9]. Clearly property $P(d, \mathcal{T})$ implies that $(X, \mathcal{T})$ is σ -fragmented by d . If $(X, \mathcal{T})$ is descriptive, then the converse implication holds too.

If X is compact and is fragmented by some lower semicontinuous metric, we say that X is a *Radon–Nikodym compact*. A compact space is Namioka–Phelps if and only if it is both descriptive and Radon–Nikodym. The reader is referred to [12] for the basic facts about this interesting class of spaces.

As has already been remarked, Theorem C leads to a LUR renorming of $\mathcal{C}(K)$ when K has property P for some Reznichenko metric. However, it is not clear whether such a compact space also has P for some lower semicontinuous metric. The situation is closely related to the open problem of whether every continuous image of a Radon–Nikodym compact is again a Radon–Nikodym compact. For recent work on this topic, and the class of *quasi-Radon–Nikodým* compact spaces see [1,5,13]. A compact space is quasi-Radon–Nikodým if it is fragmented by some Reznichenko metric. Every continuous image of a Radon–Nikodým compact is quasi-Radon–Nikodým. All this means that we may state a theorem which may (or may not!) be a generalization of Theorem B as follows.

Theorem D. *If K is descriptive and is a continuous image of a Radon–Nikodym compact then $\mathcal{C}(K)$ admits a LUR renorming.*

The author does not know whether $\mathcal{C}(K)$ is LUR-renormable for all descriptive compacta K . By Raja’s results the corresponding question about Banach spaces would be whether a space Z for which the dual norm on Z^* is w^* LUR has itself an equivalent LUR norm. The most we can get in this direction (using Theorem D, Raja’s theorem and Theorem 1.5.6 of [4]) is the following.

Corollary. *Let Z be a Banach space such that the dual norm on Z^* is w^* LUR. If, in addition, Z is a subspace of an Asplund-generated space then Z admits an equivalent LUR norm.*

3. DESCRIPTIVE COMPACT SPACES AND σ -ISOLATED FAMILIES

The aim of this section is to develop some additional structure in a descriptive compact space. We start by making some general observations about isolated and σ -isolated families, which are valid without any compactness assumption. Let K be a topological space and let $\mathcal{I}$ be an isolated family of subsets of K . Then, by definition, we have

$$N \cap \overline{\bigcup \mathcal{I} \setminus \{N\}} = \emptyset,$$

for all $N \in \mathcal{I}$. If we set

$$\tilde{N} = \overline{N} \setminus \overline{\bigcup \mathcal{I} \setminus \{N\}},$$

and $\tilde{\mathcal{I}} = \{\tilde{N} : N \in \mathcal{I}\}$ then it is clear that $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ is again an isolated family. If $N = \tilde{N}$ for all $N \in \mathcal{I}$, we shall say that $\mathcal{I}$ is a *regular* isolated family.

We shall now introduce some notation for regular isolated families, which will be employed consistently in all that follows. If $\mathcal{I}$ is a regular isolated family we write I for the union of the family $\mathcal{I}$, that is

$$I = \bigcup \mathcal{I},$$

and we define

$$J = \{t \in K : \text{each neighbourhood of } t \text{ meets at least two members of } \mathcal{I}\}.$$

By virtue of its definition, J is a closed set. Moreover, the closure $\overline{I}$ is the union of its disjoint subsets I and J ; that is to say, $J = \overline{I} \setminus I$.

Let us now consider a space with a covering $\mathcal{S}$, which is the union of countably many regular isolated families $\mathcal{I}(i)$ ($i \in \omega$). In accordance with the notation above, we write

$$I(i) = \bigcup \mathcal{I}(i), \quad J(i) = \overline{I}(i) \setminus I(i).$$

We now make a recursive definition of further families $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{i}) = \mathcal{I}(i_0, \dots, i_k)$, together with the associated sets $J(\mathbf{i})$, when $\mathbf{i} = (i_0, \dots, i_k) \in \omega^{<\omega}$ is a finite sequence of natural numbers.

$$\begin{aligned} I(1_0, \dots, i_k) &= \bigcup \mathcal{I}(1_0, \dots, i_k) \\ J(i_0, \dots, i_k) &= \overline{I}(i_0, \dots, i_k) \setminus I(i_0, \dots, i_k) \\ \mathcal{I}(i_0, \dots, i_k, i_{k+1}) &= \{N \cap J(i_0, \dots, i_k) : N \in \mathcal{I}(i_{k+1})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.1. *If $\mathbf{i} = (i_0, \dots, i_k)$ and $0 \leq l < k$ then*

$$I(i_0, \dots, i_k) \subseteq J(i_0, \dots, i_l) \subseteq J(i_l).$$

If the natural numbers $i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k$ are not all distinct then $I(i_0, \dots, i_k) = \emptyset$.

Proof. By definition

$$I(i_0, \dots, i_{m+1}) = I(i_{m+1}) \cap J(i_0, \dots, i_m),$$

so that

$$I(i_0, \dots, i_{m+1}) \subseteq J(i_0, \dots, i_m).$$

Now $J(i_0, \dots, i_m)$ is a closed set, so we have

$$J(i_0, \dots, i_{m+1}) \subseteq \overline{I}(i_0, \dots, i_{m+1}) \subseteq J(i_0, \dots, i_m).$$

Since this is true for all m , we easily obtain

$$I(i_0, \dots, i_k) \subseteq J(i_0, \dots, i_l)$$

for $0 \leq l < k$.

To see that $J(i_0, \dots, i_l) \subseteq J(i_l)$, consider $t \in J(i_0, \dots, i_l)$. Every neighbourhood of t meets at least two members of the family $\mathcal{I}(i_0, \dots, i_l)$, and hence at least two members of the family $\mathcal{I}(i_l)$, so that $t \in J(i_l)$.

Finally, suppose that $i_m = i_l$ for some $0 \leq m < l \leq k$. We have

$$I(i_0, \dots, i_l) \subseteq I(i_l) \cap J(i_0, \dots, i_m) \subseteq I(i_l) \cap J(i_m),$$

which is empty since $I(i) \cap J(i) = \emptyset$ for all i .

We shall be concerned especially with the sets $I(\mathbf{i})$ when the sequence $\mathbf{i}$ is strictly increasing. We shall write Σ for the set of all such sequences $\mathbf{i} = (i_0, \dots, i_k)$ with $k \geq 0$ and $i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_k$. We equip Σ with a total order $\prec$, defined by saying that $\mathbf{i} = (i_0, \dots, i_k) \prec \mathbf{j} = (j_0, \dots, j_l)$ if *either*

- (1) there exists $r \leq \min\{k, l\}$ such that $i_s = j_s$ for $0 \leq s < r$ and $i_r < j_r$, or
- (2) $k > l$ and $j_s = i_s$ for $0 \leq s \leq l$.

I am grateful to Gilles Godefroy who pointed out that this order may be regarded as the usual lexicographic order if we think of our finite sequences as infinite sequences terminating in a long run of ∞ 's.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathbf{j} = (j_0, \dots, j_l) \in \Sigma$ and write*

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \bigcup_{\substack{0 \leq r \leq l \\ j_{r-1} < i < j_r}} \bar{I}(j_0, \dots, j_{r-1}, i) \\ A_2 &= \bigcup_{\substack{k > l \\ i_k > i_{k-1} > \dots > i_{l+1} > j_l}} \bar{I}(j_0, \dots, j_l, i_{l+1}, \dots, i_k) \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{\mathbf{i} \prec \mathbf{j}} \bar{I}(\mathbf{i}) &= A_1 \cup A_2 \\ &= A_1 \cup J(\mathbf{j}). \end{aligned}$$

In particular $\bigcup_{\mathbf{i} \prec \mathbf{j}} \bar{I}(\mathbf{i})$ is a closed subset of K .

Proof. It is clear that A_2 is exactly the union of the sets $\bar{I}(\mathbf{i})$ where $\mathbf{i}$ satisfies clause (2) in the definition of the relation $\prec$. If $\mathbf{i} = (i_0, \dots, i_k)$ satisfies clause (1) of that definition, then we have

$$\bar{I}(i_0, \dots, i_k) \subseteq \bar{I}(i_0, \dots, i_r) = \bar{I}(j_0, \dots, j_{r-1}, i_r) \subseteq A_1.$$

It follows that A_1 is exactly the union of the sets $I(\mathbf{i})$ where $\mathbf{i}$ satisfies (2).

It is clear from the definitions that $A_2 \subseteq J(\mathbf{j})$, so, to prove the second equality, it will be enough to show that $J(\mathbf{j}) \subseteq A_1 \cup A_2$. Suppose then that $t \in J(\mathbf{j})$; for some i , we have $t \in I(i)$, and i is not equal to any of the j_s , since $J(\mathbf{j}) \subseteq J(j_s)$ and $I(i) \cap J(j_s) = \emptyset$. There are now two cases. If $i > j_l$ then

$$t \in I(j_0, \dots, j_l, i) \subseteq A_2.$$

If $i < j_l$ we choose r minimal with respect to $i < j_r$, noting that $i > j_{r-1}$, and observe that

$$t \in I(j_0, \dots, j_{r-1}, i) \subseteq A_1.$$

It is immediate that our set is closed, since we have shown it to be the union of the closed set $J(\mathbf{j})$ with finitely many closures $\bar{I}(\mathbf{i})$.

Given $\mathbf{j}$ and a finite subset $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{j})$ we shall write

$$G(\mathbf{j}, \mathcal{M}) = K \setminus \left(\bigcup_{\mathbf{i} \prec \mathbf{j}} \bar{I}(\mathbf{i}) \cup \overline{\bigcup \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{j}) \setminus \mathcal{M}} \right),$$

noting that this is an open subset of K .

Finally, we have a lemma which needs compactness of the space K .

Lemma 3.3. *Let K be a compact space and let $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \mathcal{I}(i)$ be a covering of K which is the union of regular isolated families $\mathcal{I}(i)$. Let H be a nonempty closed subset of K . Then there exists a minimal $\mathbf{j} \in \Sigma$ with $H \cap \bar{I}(\mathbf{j}) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, $H \cap \bar{I}(\mathbf{j}) \subseteq I(\mathbf{j})$ and there is a unique nonempty, finite $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{j})$ such that $H \cap \mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$ for all $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and $H \subseteq G(\mathbf{j}, \mathcal{M})$.*

Proof. If no minimal $\mathbf{j}$ exists, then we may find a strictly decreasing sequence

$$\mathbf{j}(0) \succ \mathbf{j}(1) \succ \dots$$

such that $H \cap \bar{I}(\mathbf{j}(n)) \neq \emptyset$ for all n , but such that $H \cap \bar{I}(\mathbf{i}) = \emptyset$ if $\mathbf{i} \prec \mathbf{j}(m)$ for all m . By Lemma 3.2, each of the sets $H_n = H \cap \bigcup_{\mathbf{i} \prec \mathbf{j}(n)} \bar{I}(\mathbf{i})$ is closed, and H_n is nonempty since $H \cap \bar{I}(\mathbf{j}_{n+1}) \subseteq H_n$. Hence, by compactness, the intersection $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} H_n$ is nonempty. But this means that $H \cap \bar{I}(\mathbf{i}) \neq \emptyset$ for some $\mathbf{i}$ satisfying $\mathbf{i} \prec \mathbf{j}(n)$ for all n . This is a contradiction.

Working now with our minimal $\mathbf{j}$, we have $\bar{I}(\mathbf{j}) = I(\mathbf{j}) \cup J(\mathbf{j})$ and by Lemma 3.2 $J(\mathbf{j}) \subseteq \bigcup_{\mathbf{i} \prec \mathbf{j}} \bar{I}(\mathbf{i})$. Thus, by minimality of $\mathbf{j}$, $H \cap J(\mathbf{j}) = \emptyset$ and so $H \cap \bar{I}(\mathbf{j}) = H \cap I(\mathbf{j})$. The compact set $H \cap \bar{I}(\mathbf{j})$ is thus covered by the family $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{j})$, the elements of which are disjoint and open, relative to $\bar{I}(\mathbf{j})$. Thus, if we define $\mathcal{M} = \{M \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{j}) : M \cap H \neq \emptyset\}$, it must be that $\mathcal{M}$ is finite. Finally, to see that $H \subseteq G(\mathbf{j}, \mathcal{M})$, we use minimality of $\mathbf{j}$ again, and the observation that $\overline{\bigcup \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{j}) \setminus \mathcal{M}} \subseteq \bar{I}(\mathbf{j}) \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{M}$, while $H \cap \bar{I}(\mathbf{j}) \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{M}$.

When K is a descriptive compact space having property P with some metric d then there exists, for each natural number l , a σ -isolated covering $\mathcal{S}^l = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \mathcal{I}^l(i)$ of K , consisting of sets that are of d -diameter at most 2^{-l} . When d is lower semi-continuous, the sets $\tilde{N}$ defined at the start of this section are also of diameter at most 2^{-l} . In general, this is not the case: however, each $\tilde{N}$ is contained in the $\mathcal{T}$ -closure of some set (namely N) of d -diameter at most 2^{-l} . We may summarize the situation in the form of a proposition.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $(K, \mathcal{T})$ be a compact space equipped with a metric d such that property $P(d, \mathcal{T})$ holds. Then, for each $l \in \omega$, there is a covering $\mathcal{S}^l$ of K , which is the union $\bigcup_{i \in \omega} \mathcal{I}^l(i)$ of regular isolated families $\mathcal{I}^l(i)$, such that each $N \in \mathcal{S}^l$ is contained in the $\mathcal{T}$ -closure of some set of d -diameter at most 2^{-l} .*

From now on, we shall assume $\mathcal{S}^l = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \mathcal{I}^l(i)$ to be as above, and shall construct the associated $\mathcal{I}^l(\mathbf{i})$, $I^l(\mathbf{i})$, $J^l(\mathbf{i})$ and $G^l(\mathbf{i}, \mathcal{M})$ as described in this section.

4. CONSTRUCTION OF A NORM ON $\mathcal{C}(K)$

We now set about constructing a norm on $\mathcal{C}(K)$ when K is a descriptive compact space. As well as the topological machinery set up in the last section, we shall need one more ingredient. Let L be a closed subset of K , let l be a natural number, let m, n be positive integers and let $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Sigma$; we write $\mathcal{B}(L, l, m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$ for the set of all pairs $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ of finite subsets of $\mathcal{I}^l(\mathbf{i}), \mathcal{I}^l(\mathbf{j})$, respectively, which satisfy $\#\mathcal{M} = m$, $\#\mathcal{N} = n$, $M \cap L \neq \emptyset$ for all $M \in \mathcal{M}$, $N \cap L \neq \emptyset$ for all $N \in \mathcal{N}$, and

$$\overline{\bigcup \mathcal{M}} \cap \overline{\bigcup \mathcal{N}} = \emptyset.$$

If $f \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ and $L, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}$ are as above, we set

$$\Phi(f, L, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \max f[L \cap \overline{N}] - m^{-1} \sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \min f[L \cap \overline{M}] \right)^+,$$

noticing that Φ is a non-negative, positively homogeneous, convex function of its argument f and that

$$\Phi(f, L, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{osc}(f \upharpoonright L) \leq \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty.$$

Whenever $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ is a pair of finite sets as above, satisfying

$$\overline{\bigcup \mathcal{M}} \cap \overline{\bigcup \mathcal{N}} = \emptyset,$$

we fix, once and for all, a pair of closed subsets $(X(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}), Y(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}))$ such that

$$X(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \cup Y(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) = K, \quad X(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \cap \bigcup \mathcal{N} = Y(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \cap \bigcup \mathcal{M} = \emptyset.$$

In the definition of our norm, we shall also need to fix positive real numbers $c(\mathbf{i})$ ($\mathbf{i} \in \Sigma$) with $\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \Sigma} c(\mathbf{i}) \leq 1$. We could, for instance, take

$$c(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k) = 2^{-2^{i_0} - 2^{i_1} - \dots - 2^{i_k}}.$$

Proposition 4.1. *There are unique non-negative real-valued functions $\Omega(f, L, l)$, $\Theta(f, L, l, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, m, n)$, $\Theta_p(f, L, l, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, m, n)$, $\Theta_p(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ and $\Psi(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$, defined for functions $f \in \mathcal{C}(K)$, closed subsets L of K , natural numbers l, m, n, p , elements $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}$ of Σ , and $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \in \mathcal{B}(L, l, m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$, which are convex in their argument f , and which satisfy the inequalities*

$$\begin{aligned} &\Omega(f, L, l), \Theta(f, L, l, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, m, n), \Theta_p(f, L, l, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, m, n), \\ &\Theta_p(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}), \Psi(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \leq \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

as well as the relations

$$\begin{aligned} 6\Omega(f, L, l)^2 &= \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty^2 + \text{osc}(f \upharpoonright L)^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Sigma} c(\mathbf{i})c(\mathbf{j}) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-m-n} \Theta(f, L, l, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, m, n)^2 \\ \Theta(f, L, l, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, m, n)^2 &= \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} 2^{-p} \Theta_p(f, L, l, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, m, n)^2 \\ \Theta_p(f, L, l, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, m, n) &= \sup_{(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \in \mathcal{B}(L, l, m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})} \Theta_p(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \\ 2\Theta_p(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})^2 &= \Phi(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})^2 + p^{-1} \Psi(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})^2 \\ 3\Psi(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})^2 &= \Omega(f, L \cap X(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}), l)^2 + \Omega(f, L \cap Y(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}), l)^2 \end{aligned}$$

We may define a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on $\mathcal{C}(K)$, equivalent to the supremum norm, by setting

$$\|f\|^2 = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-l-1} \Omega(f, K, l)^2.$$

Proof. The functions Θ and Θ_p are defined in terms of Ψ and the known function Φ defined earlier. Hence all we have to show is that the mutual recursion in the definitions of Ω and Ψ really does define something. We do this by applying a fixed-point theorem, as in [8].

Let Z be the set of all tuples $(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ with $f \in \mathcal{C}(K)$, L a closed subset of K , l a positive integer and $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \in \bigcup_{m,n,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}} B(L, l, m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$. Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be the set of all pairs (Ω, Ψ) of non-negative real-valued functions $\Omega(f, L, l)$, $\Psi(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$, which are convex, symmetric and positively homogeneous in their argument f , and which satisfy the inequalities

$$\Omega(f, L, l), \Psi(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \leq \|f\|_{\infty}.$$

Define a metric ρ on $\mathcal{Z}$ by setting

$$\rho((\Omega, \Psi), (\Omega', \Psi')) = \sup \max \{ |\Omega(f, L, l)^2 - \Omega'(f, L, l)^2|, |\Psi(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})^2 - \Psi'(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})^2| \},$$

where the supremum is taken over all $L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}$ and all f with $\|f\|_{\infty} \leq 1$. It is clear that this makes $\mathcal{Z}$ a complete metric space.

Now define a mapping $F : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ by setting $F(\Omega, \Psi) = (\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\Psi})$, where

$$3\tilde{\Psi}(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})^2 = \Omega(f, L \cap X(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}), l)^2 + \Omega(f, L \cap Y(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}), l)^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 6\tilde{\Omega}(f, L, l)^2 &= \|f \upharpoonright L\|_{\infty}^2 + \text{osc}(f \upharpoonright L)^2 \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Sigma} c(\mathbf{i})c(\mathbf{j}) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-m-n} \Theta(f, L, l, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, m, n)^2, \end{aligned}$$

the function Θ being obtained from Ψ via the formulae in the statement of the Proposition. It may be noted that, though the function Θ is not symmetric in f , we do have

$$\Theta(-f, L, l, m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}) = \Theta(f, L, l, n, m, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{i}),$$

so that $\tilde{\Omega}$ is symmetric.

It is easy to check that $\rho(F(\Omega, \Psi), F(\Omega', \Psi')) \leq \frac{2}{3}\rho((\Omega, \Psi), (\Omega', \Psi'))$, so that F has a unique fixed point, by Banach's fixed point theorem. This fixed point yields the functions that we want, and hence enables us to define the norm $\|\cdot\|$.

It is the norm defined in Proposition 4.1 that we shall show to locally uniformly rotund in the case where d is a lower semi-continuous (or, more generally, Reznichenko) metric fragmenting the descriptive compact space K . By the discussion at the end of §3 it will be enough to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $(K, \mathcal{T})$ be a descriptive compact space and let d be a metric on K such that property $P(d, \mathcal{T})$ holds. Let the norm $\|\cdot\|$ be defined as in Proposition 4.1. If f be a function in $\mathcal{C}(K)$ which is d -uniformly continuous then the norm $\|\cdot\|$ locally uniformly convex at f .*

The proof of this theorem will occupy the remainder of the paper. We shall consider a sequence (f_r) in $\mathcal{C}(K)$ which satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2}\|f\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|f_r\|^2 - \|\frac{1}{2}(f + f_r)\|^2 \rightarrow 0,$$

as $r \rightarrow \infty$. In the language introduced earlier, we are assuming that the LUR hypothesis holds for $\|\cdot\|$ (and our given f and f_r). We have to prove that f_r converges to f uniformly on K . Given $\epsilon > 0$, we may use uniform continuity of f to choose a positive integer l such that

$$d(t, u) \leq 2^{-l} \implies |f(t) - f(u)| \leq \frac{1}{3}\epsilon.$$

Lemma 4.3. *If $N \in \mathcal{S}^l$ then the oscillation of r on N is at most $\frac{1}{3}\epsilon$.*

Proof. As in Proposition 3.4, we are supposing that for each $N \in \mathcal{S}^l$ there is some set M of d -diameter at most 2^{-l} such that N is contained in the $\mathcal{T}$ -closure of M . The uniform continuity estimate tells us that the oscillation of r on M is at most $\frac{1}{3}\epsilon$ and the $\mathcal{T}$ -continuity of f enables us to extend this to N .

The definition of our norm as an ℓ^2 -sum

$$\|f\|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-k-1} \Omega(f, K, k)^2$$

implies, thanks to an observation we made earlier, that the LUR hypothesis holds for each of the functions $\Omega(\cdot, K, k)$ and in particular for $\Omega(\cdot, K, l)$. This is all we shall use in our proof that $\|f - f_r\|_{\infty}$ is eventually smaller than ϵ .

5. GOOD CHOICES.

Let L be a closed subset of K , let m, n be positive integers and let $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Sigma$. (Recall that f , ϵ and l are now fixed.) For a pair $(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}) \in B(L, l, m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$, we define the following non-negative real numbers:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \min f[L] \\ a &= \max_{M \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} \inf f[L \cap \overline{M}] \\ \alpha &= \min f[L \setminus G^l(\mathbf{i}, \widetilde{\mathcal{M}})] \\ \beta &= \max f[L \setminus G^l(\mathbf{j}, \widetilde{\mathcal{N}})] \\ b &= \min_{N \in \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}} \sup f[L \cap \overline{N}] \\ B &= \max f[L]. \end{aligned}$$

Of course, we have $a \geq A$, $\alpha \geq A$, $b \leq B$ and $\beta \leq B$. We shall say that the pair $(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{N}})$ is a *good choice* (of type $(m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$) on L if

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1}(B - \beta) &> (B - b) + (a - A) \quad \text{and} \\ m^{-1}(\alpha - A) &> (B - b) + (a - A). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.1. *If L is a closed subset of K and the oscillation of f on L is at least ϵ then there is at least one good choice on L .*

Proof. Let $H_1 = \{t \in L : f(t) = \max f[L]\}$ and apply Lemma 3.3. There exist $\mathbf{j} \in \Sigma$ and a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ of $\mathcal{I}^l(\mathbf{j})$ such that $H_1 \cap N \neq \emptyset$ for all $N \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ and $H_1 \subseteq G^l(\mathbf{j}, \tilde{\mathcal{N}})$. It follows that, in the notation just established, we have $B = b$ and $B > \beta$. A similar argument applied to the set $H_2 = \{t \in L : f(t) = \min f[L]\}$ yields $\mathbf{i}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ such that $A = a$ and $A < \alpha$. To finish showing that $(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{\mathcal{N}})$ is a good choice, we need to check that $(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{\mathcal{N}})$ is in $B(L, l, m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$, and what remains to be proved is that $\overline{M} \cap \overline{N} = \emptyset$ for all $M \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and all $N \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}$.

Our choice of l ensures that the oscillation of f on each $M \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and on each $N \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ is at most $\epsilon/3$, and, by continuity of f , the same holds for each $\overline{M}$ and each $\overline{N}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \max f[\overline{M}] &\leq A + \epsilon/3 \\ \min f[\overline{N}] &\geq B - \epsilon/3, \end{aligned}$$

for all such M, N . Since we are assuming that the oscillation $B - A$ of f on L is at least ϵ , we deduce that $\overline{M} \cap \overline{N} = \emptyset$ as claimed.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $L_1, L_2, \dots$ be a decreasing sequence of non-empty closed subsets of K with intersection L . If $(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{\mathcal{N}})$ is a good choice on L , then it is a good choice on L_s for arbitrarily large values of s .*

Proof. Let us define $A, B, \alpha, \beta, b, B$ as above and set

$$\begin{aligned} A_s &= \min f[L_s] \\ a_s &= \max_{M \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}} \inf f[L_s \cap \overline{M}] \\ \alpha_s &= \min f[L_s \setminus G^l(\mathbf{i}, \tilde{\mathcal{M}})], \end{aligned}$$

with analogous definitions for β_s, b_s, B_s . Standard compactness arguments show that $A_s \rightarrow A$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$, and so on. Hence the inequalities defining a good choice for L_s do hold for all sufficiently large s .

The third lemma in this section reveals why good choices are so named: it is a “rigidity condition” of a type that occurs commonly in LUR proofs. It will be convenient to state it in terms of “strong attainment” of a certain supremum, a notion with which most readers will be familiar, but which we shall nonetheless define explicitly. If $(\gamma_i)_{i \in I}$ is a bounded family of real numbers, we shall say that the supremum $\sup_{i \in I} \gamma_i$ is *strongly attained* at j if $\sup_{i \in I \setminus \{j\}} \gamma_i < \gamma_j$. This of course implies that if (i_r) is a sequence in I and $\gamma_{i_r} \rightarrow \sup_{i \in I} \gamma_i$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, then $i_r = j$ for all large enough r .

Lemma 5.3. *Let L be a closed subset of K and suppose that there exists a good choice $(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{\mathcal{N}})$ of type $(m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$ on L . Then the supremum $\sup\{\Phi(f, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) : (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \in B(L, l, m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})\}$ is strongly attained at $(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{\mathcal{N}})$.*

Proof. Let us write $A, a, \alpha, \beta, b, B$ for the quantities associated with $(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{\mathcal{N}})$ in the definition of a good choice. So we have $\min f[L \cap \overline{M}] \leq a$ and $\max f[L \cap \overline{N}] \geq b$ for all $M \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and all $N \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}$. Thus $2\Phi(f, \tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{\mathcal{N}}) \geq b - a$.

Now suppose that $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ is in $B(L, l, m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$ and that $\mathcal{M} \neq \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ have the same number of elements, namely m , $\mathcal{M}$ must have at least one element M_0 which is not in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. It follows from the definition of $G(\mathbf{i}, \widetilde{\mathcal{M}})$ that $\overline{M}_0 \cap G(\mathbf{i}, \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}) = \emptyset$ so that $\min f[L \cap \overline{M}_0] \geq \alpha$. For the other $m - 1$ elements of $\mathcal{M}$, we certainly have $\min f[L \cap \overline{M}_0] \geq A$, and of course $\max f[L \cap \overline{N}] \leq B$ for all $N \in \mathcal{N}$. Hence

$$2\Phi[f, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}] \leq \frac{1}{n}nB - \frac{1}{m}(\alpha + (m-1)A) = B - A - \frac{1}{m}(\alpha - A).$$

By the definition of a good choice, this is strictly smaller than $b - a$. Similarly, we show that if $\mathcal{N} \neq \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ then

$$2\Phi[f, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}] \leq B - A - \frac{1}{n}(B - \beta),$$

another quantity which is known to be smaller than $b - a$.

6. AN APPLICATION OF DEVILLE'S LEMMA

We record for convenience the following version of Lemma VII.1.1 of [2].

Lemma 6.1. *Let $(\phi_i)_{i \in I}$ and $(\psi_i)_{i \in I}$ be two pointwise-bounded families of non-negative, real-valued, convex functions on a real vector space Z . For $i \in I$ and positive integers p define functions $\theta_{i,p}$, θ_p and θ by setting*

$$\begin{aligned} 2\theta_{i,p}(x)^2 &= \phi_i(x)^2 + p^{-1}\psi_i(x)^2 \\ \theta_p(x) &= \sup_{i \in I} \theta_{i,p}(x) \\ \theta(x)^2 &= \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} 2^{-p} \theta_p(x)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let x and x_r ($r \in \omega$) be elements of Z and assume that

$$\frac{1}{2}\theta(x)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\theta(x_r)^2 - \theta\left(\frac{1}{2}(x + x_r)\right)^2 \rightarrow 0$$

as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Then there is a sequence (i_r) of elements of I such that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{i_r}(x) &\rightarrow \sup_{i \in I} \phi_i(x) \quad \text{and} \\ \frac{1}{2}\psi_{i_r}(x)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\psi_{i_r}(x_r)^2 - \psi_{i_r}\left(\frac{1}{2}(x + x_r)\right)^2 &\rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $r \rightarrow \infty$.

Corollary 6.2. *If, in addition to the hypotheses of Lemma 6.1, we assume that the supremum $\sup_{i \in I} \phi_i(x)$ is strongly attained at j , then we may conclude that*

$$\frac{1}{2}\psi_j(x)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\psi_j(x_r)^2 - \psi_j\left(\frac{1}{2}(x + x_r)\right)^2 \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. This is of course automatic, since the assumptions imply that a sequence (i_r) for which

$$\phi_{i_r}(x) \rightarrow \sup_{i \in I} \phi_i(x)$$

as $r \rightarrow \infty$ must necessarily satisfy $i_r = j$ for all large enough j .

We may rephrase the statement of this corollary by saying that if the LUR hypothesis holds for θ and the supremum $\sup_{i \in I} \phi_i(x)$ is strongly attained at j , then the LUR hypothesis holds for ψ_j . It is precisely this formulation that we shall be applying in the next result, where we return to the proof of Theorem 4.2 and where of course we are still dealing with fixed f, f_r, ϵ and l .

Proposition 6.3. *Let L be a closed subset of K and assume that the LUR hypothesis holds for $\Omega(\cdot, L, l)$. If $(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{N}})$ is a good choice on L then the LUR hypothesis holds for $\Omega(\cdot, L \cap X(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}), l)$ and $\Omega(\cdot, L \cap Y(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}), l)$.*

Proof. Let $(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{N}})$ be of type $(m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$. The expression for $\Omega(\cdot, L, l)$ as an ℓ^2 -sum implies that the LUR hypothesis holds for $\Theta(\cdot, L, l, m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$, which is readily recognizable as a function to which we may apply Deville's lemma. Moreover, by Lemma 5.3, we are in the situation where the supremum $\sup_{(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \in B(m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})} \Phi(f, L, l, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ is strongly attained at $(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{N}})$. So, by the above corollary, the LUR hypothesis holds for $\Psi(\cdot, L, l, \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{N}})$. The formula for this as an ℓ^2 sum now shows that the LUR hypothesis holds for $\Omega(\cdot, L \cap X(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}), l)$ and $\Omega(\cdot, L \cap Y(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}), l)$, as claimed.

7. PUTTING TOGETHER THE PIECES

Lemma 7.1. *Let L be a closed subset of K on which the oscillation of f is smaller than ϵ . If the LUR hypothesis holds for $\Omega(\cdot, L, l)$ then $\|(f - f_r) \upharpoonright L\|_\infty < \epsilon$ for all large enough r .*

Proof. From the formula for Ω as an ℓ^2 -sum, we see that the LUR hypothesis holds for the the convex functions $g \mapsto \|g \upharpoonright L\|_\infty$ and $g \mapsto \text{osc}(g \upharpoonright L)$. So in particular, $\|f_r \upharpoonright L\|_\infty \rightarrow \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty$, $\|\frac{1}{2}(f + f_r) \upharpoonright L\|_\infty \rightarrow \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty$ and $\text{osc}(f_r \upharpoonright L) \rightarrow \text{osc}(f \upharpoonright L)$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. The required result follows from a fairly standard argument. Let us write $\text{osc}(f \upharpoonright L) = \epsilon - 4\eta$ and suppose that r is large enough for us to have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_r \upharpoonright L\|_\infty &< \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty + \eta \\ \|\tfrac{1}{2}(f + f_r) \upharpoonright L\|_\infty &> \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty - \eta \\ \text{osc}(f_r \upharpoonright L) &< \epsilon - 3\eta. \end{aligned}$$

There exists $t \in K$ with $|\frac{1}{2}(f + f_r)(t)| > \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty - \eta$, and we may assume that $(f + f_r)(t) > 0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f_r(t) &> 2\|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty - 2\eta - \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty \\ &= \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty - 2\eta \\ f(t) &> 2\|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty - 2\eta - \|f_r \upharpoonright L\|_\infty \\ &> \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty - 3\eta \end{aligned}$$

Now for any $u \in L$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(u) &\geq f(t) - \text{osc}(f \upharpoonright L) \\ &> \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty - 3\eta - \epsilon + 4\eta \\ &= \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty - \epsilon + \eta \\ f(u) &\leq \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty \\ f_r(u) &\geq f_r(t) - \text{osc}(f_r \upharpoonright L) \\ &> \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty - 2\eta - \epsilon + 3\eta \\ &= \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty - \epsilon + \eta \\ f_r(u) &\leq \|f_r \upharpoonright L\|_\infty \\ &< \|f \upharpoonright L\|_\infty + \eta. \end{aligned}$$

It follows immediately that $|f(u) - f_r(u)| < \epsilon$.

Proposition 7.2. *There is a finite covering $\mathcal{L}$ of K with closed subsets such that the LUR hypothesis holds for $\Omega(\cdot, L, l)$ and the oscillation of f on L is smaller than ϵ , for each $L \in \mathcal{L}$.*

Proof. We shall define a tree Υ whose elements will be certain pairs (L, s) with L a closed subset of K and s a natural number. We shall give a recursive definition which will specify which such pairs are nodes of our tree, and shall define the tree ordering by saying which (if any) nodes are the *immediate successors* of a given (L, s) . To do this, we shall need to fix a mapping $\tau : \omega \rightarrow \omega \times \omega \times \Sigma \times \Sigma$ with the property that each quadruple $(m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$ occurs as $\tau(s)$ for infinitely many $s \in \omega$.

It will be ensured during the construction that, whenever $(L, s) \in \Upsilon$, the LUR hypothesis holds for $\Omega(\cdot, L, l)$. We start by declaring that there is one minimal node $(K, 0)$. (Notice that our hypotheses do ensure that the LUR hypothesis holds for $\Omega(\cdot, K, l)$.) If (L, s) is a node of our tree then there are three possibilities:

- (1) if the oscillation of f on L is smaller than ϵ then (L, s) has no immediate successors in the tree (that is to say, (L, s) is a maximal element);
- (2) if the oscillation of f on L is at least ϵ and there is a good choice $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ of type $\tau(s)$ on L then we introduce into Υ two immediate successors, $(L \cap X(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}), s + 1)$ and $(L \cap Y(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}), s + 1)$, of (L, s) (Notice that, by Proposition 6.3, the LUR hypothesis holds for the Ω functions associated with these two new nodes.);
- (3) if the oscillation of f on L is at least ϵ but no good choice of type $\tau(s)$ exists, then we introduce just one immediate successor $(L, s + 1)$ of (L, s) into the tree.

We shall now show that the tree Υ we have just constructed has only finitely many elements. By König's Lemma, it will be enough to show that Υ has no infinite branch. So suppose, if possible, that there is a sequence $(L_s)_{s \in \omega}$ of closed subsets of K such that the pairs (L_s, s) are nodes of Υ and such that, for each s , $(L_{s+1}, s + 1)$ is an immediate successor of (L_s, s) in Υ . The sets L_s form a decreasing sequence of closed subsets of K ; let us write L for their intersection. By a compactness argument, the oscillation $\text{osc}(f \upharpoonright L_s)$ tends to $\text{osc}(f \upharpoonright L)$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$. Since each (L_s, s) has successors in Υ , we have $\text{osc}(f \upharpoonright L_s) \geq \epsilon$ for each s , and we can thus deduce that $\text{osc}(f \upharpoonright L) \geq \epsilon$. So, by Lemma 5.1, there is a good choice $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ on L , of type $(m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$ say. By Lemma 5.2, $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ is also a good choice on L_s for all sufficiently large s . Recalling that $\tau(s) = (m, n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$ for infinitely many values of s , we see that we can choose s such that $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ is a good choice on L_s of type $\tau(s)$. The way we constructed the tree Υ means that L_{s+1} is one or other of the two sets $L_s \cap X(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ and $L_s \cap Y(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$. So one or other of $L_{s+1} \cap \bigcup \mathcal{N}$ and $L_{s+1} \cap \bigcup \mathcal{M}$ is empty. But this is absurd, since $L_{s+1} \supseteq L$ and the sets $L \cap M$, $L \cap N$ are nonempty for all $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and $N \in \mathcal{N}$.

Having proved that Υ is finite, we define $\mathcal{L}$ to be the set of all L such that there is a maximal element of Υ of the form (L, r) . Our construction ensures that the LUR hypothesis holds for $\Omega(\cdot, L, l)$ for each such L , and, by maximality, the oscillation of f on any such L is smaller than ϵ . We just need to show that $\bigcup \mathcal{L} = K$. This is most easily proved by induction: for each s let $\mathcal{L}_s = \{L : (L, s) \in \Upsilon\}$; I claim that, for all s , $\bigcup \mathcal{L} \cup \bigcup \mathcal{L}_s = K$. Certainly this is true for $s = 0$ since $\mathcal{L}_0 = \{K\}$. To deal with the inductive step let $t \in \bigcup \mathcal{L} \cup \bigcup \mathcal{L}_s$ be given. If $t \in \bigcup \mathcal{L}$ there is no problem, so assume that $t \in L$ for some $L \in \mathcal{L}_s$. By the construction of Υ , one of (1), (2) and (3) occurs for the pair (L, s) . If it is (1) then $t \in L \in \mathcal{L}$. If it is (2) then t is one

or other of the two sets $L \cap X$ and $L \cap Y$ which themselves are members of $\mathcal{L}_{s+1}$. Finally if it is (3) then $t \in L \in \mathcal{L}_{s+1}$. In all cases, we have $t \in \bigcup \mathcal{L} \cup \bigcup \mathcal{L}_{s+1}$, which completes our proof by induction. Since Υ is finite, $\mathcal{L}_s$ is empty for large enough s , which shows that $\bigcup \mathcal{L} = K$.

We can now finish the proof of Theorem 4.2. Indeed, by Proposition 7.2, K is the union of finitely many subsets L , for each of which $\sup_{t \in L} |f_r(t) - f(t)|$ is eventually smaller than ϵ . So $\|f_r - f\|_\infty$ is eventually smaller than ϵ , which is what we wanted to prove.

REFERENCES

1. A.D. Arvanitakis, *Some remarks on Radon–Nikodým compact spaces*, Fund. Math. **172** (2002), 41–60.
2. R. Deville, G. Godefroy and V. Zizler, *Smoothness and renormings in Banach spaces*, Longman, Harlow, 1993.
3. P. Enflo, *Banach spaces which may be given an equivalent uniformly convex norm*, Israel J. Math. **13** (1972), 281–288.
4. M. Fabian, *Gâteaux-differentiability of convex functions and topology*, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1997.
5. M. Fabian, M. Heisler and E. Matoušková, *Remarks on continuous images of Radon–Nikodým compacta*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **39** (1998), 59–69.
6. P. Hájek and R.G. Haydon, *Smooth norms and approximation in Banach spaces of the type $C(K)$* , to appear.
7. R.W. Hansell, *Descriptive sets and the topology of non-separable Banach spaces*, Serdica **27** (2001), 1–66.
8. R.G. Haydon, *Trees in renorming theory*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **78** (1999), 541–584.
9. J.E. Jayne, I. Namioka and C.A. Rogers σ -fragmentable Banach spaces, Mathematika **39** (1992), 161–168 and 197–215.
10. P. Kenderov and W.B. Moors, *Game characterization of fragmentability of topological spaces*, Proc. of the 25th Spring Conf. Union of Bulg. Mathematicians, Kazanlak (1996), 8–18.
11. A. Moltó, J. Orihuela, S. Troyanski and M. Valdivia, *On weakly uniformly rotund Banach spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **163** (1999), 353–271.
12. I. Namioka, *Radon–Nikodým compact spaces and fragmentability*, Mathematika **34** (1987), 258–281.
13. I. Namioka, *On generalizations of Radon–Nikodým compact spaces*, Topology Proceedings **26**, 741–750.
14. G. Pisier, *Martingales with values in uniformly convex spaces*, Israel J. Math. **20**, 326–350.
15. M. Raja, *On dual locally uniformly rotund norms*, Israel J. Math. **129** (2002), 77–91.
16. M. Raja, *Weak* locally uniformly rotund norms and descriptive compact spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **197** (2003), 1–13.

BRASENOSE COLLEGE, OXFORD OX1 4AJ, U.K

E-mail address: richard.haydon@brasenose.oxford.ac.uk